FRONTLINE JOURNALS

Frontline Marketing, Management and Economics Journal
ISSN: 2752-700X

Semantic Compression in Note Taking During Consecutive Interpreting: Evidence from English–Uzbek Diplomatic Discourse

Islamova Nozima Anvarqizi
PhD, Tashkent State University of Economics, Uzbekistan

A R T I C L E I N f O

Article history:
Submission Date: 11 February 2026
Accepted Date: 18 March 2026
Published Date: 10 April 2026
VOLUME: Vol.06 Issue04
Page No. 25-34
DOI: -
https://doi.org/10.37547/marketing-fmmej-06-04-05

A B S T R A C T

The aim of this research paper is to examine semantic compression in note-taking during consecutive interpreting by focusing on how compressed notes may underrepresent modality, evaluative stance, and pragmatic mitigation in English–Uzbek diplomatic discourse. The study treats notes as semantic cues rather than a transcript by building on cognitive and pedagogical descriptions of consecutive interpreting as a two-phase process (listening + written fixation–target-language reformulation). Using a small, transparent corpus of official bilingual diplomatic texts (English and Uzbek versions published by official Uzbek state platforms), the analysis compares minimal “proposition-only” notes with “semantic-cue-enriched” notes that explicitly encode modality or stance. Findings show that the main risk of compression is not loss of factual content, but shifts in diplomatic tone, especially when hedges (e.g., it should be noted, would be appropriate), deontic modality (should), and stance markers (certainly, concern) are not represented in the notes. The paper proposes a language-oriented semantic-cue layer for note-taking that preserves diplomatic pragmatics while remaining compatible with compression principles.

Keywords: consecutive interpreting; note-taking; semantic compression; interpreting steganography; modality; evaluative stance; pragmatic mitigation; diplomatic discourse; English–Uzbek.

INTRODUCTION

Consecutive interpreting is usually described as a two-phase activity: firstly, the interpreter perceives the source message and fixes it in writing, and then produces the target-language message using the notes as support (Bezus, 2023, p. 26). In this article, it is said that note-taking is not an optional add-on, but it is a time critical cognitive tool that supports memory and planning. From the perspective of limited cognitive resources, interpreting requires the interpreter to allocate attention across concurrent efforts. In Gile’s Effort Models framing, multiple efforts compete for limited attentional resources, and performance can deteriorate when capacity is saturated (Gile, 1999, pp. 154–156). Although Gile’s 1999 Hermes article focuses on simultaneous interpreting, it explicitly formulates the general “competition” logic of effort allocation and the “tightrope” idea (working close to saturation), which is directly relevant to understanding why note-taking must compress information rather than reproduce it verbatim.

In interpreter training and practice, one recurring principle is that notes should capture meaningful structure rather than surface wording. In Russian research traditions, the concept of interpreting semantography (переводческаясемантография) is defined as a mental analytic–synthetic process of processing and fixing information to reduce working-memory load and prepare the program of target-text production (Alikina, 2012, p. 23). Uzbek-language methodological writing similarly emphasizes that semantographic notes should not be stenography; they should record meaning concisely and eliminate redundant volume (Nurmatova, 2023, pp. 160–161). However, diplomatic discourse poses an additional challenge: tone is meaning. Diplomatic statements always rely on hedging, cautious recommendation, calibrated obligation, and concern signaling. If note-taking compresses away these pragmatic layers, interpreters may reconstruct a message that remains factually correct, but becomes too direct or too vague, which is a non-trivial shift in diplomatic communication. Therefore, thispaperasks:

1. Which semantic/pragmatic dimensions are most vulnerable to semantic compression in English–Uzbek diplomatic discourse?

2. How can notes remain compressed while still encoding modality, stance, and mitigation reliably?

Semantic Compression as a Note-Taking Mechanism

Working definition

In this paper, semantic compression refers to the interpreter's deliberate reduction of the source speech's surface linguistic material into minimal cues (keywords, symbols, logical relations, abbreviations, and spatial layout) that allow later reconstruction of the intended meaning during the reformulation phase. In other words, the note is not a "mini-text," but an externalized semantic scaffold: it retains what is functionally necessary for producing the target message under time pressure, while leaving full lexical and syntactic realization to the interpreter at output. This definition aligns with the Russian research concept of interpreting semantography (переводческаясементография), where notes are understood as a meaning-oriented fixation that supports subsequent production. Alikina defines interpreting semantography as an analytic–synthetic mental process of processing and fixing information during perception of a potentially long stretch of speech in consecutive interpreting, specifically to reduce the load on working memory and to create a "program" for producing the translation text (Alikina, 2012, p. 23). She also emphasizes that such notes reflect the interpreter's multilingual consciousness and can be realized through different technique groups (lexical, grammatical, and structural-compositional), which implies that "compression" is not only shortening, but systematic recoding of meaning into efficient written forms (Alikina, 2012, pp. 22–23).

Uzbek methodological descriptions of tarjimasematografiyasi make the same distinction even more explicitly: semantographic notes are not stenography and should not aim at word-for-word capture. Nurmatova states that semantography should help short-term memory and represent the content/ main idea of speech; it does not write sentences word-for-word (that is the task of stenography), instead it removes redundancy and records the meaning briefly, which can later be expanded and completed during oral rendering (Nurmatova, 2023, p. 160). This framing directly supports treating semantic compression as a principled, meaning-centered reduction rather than a loss of information.

The need for semantic compression is also motivated by cognitive constraints during interpreting. In Gile's Effort Models, the production effort in the first stage of consecutive interpreting includes note production while the interpreter is still listening, meaning that listening/analysis and writing compete for limited attentional resources (Gile, 1999, p. 154). Under such conditions, verbatim writing is not just inefficient; it can destabilize comprehension and later reconstruction—hence compression is functionally necessary, not merely stylistic. Finally, empirical training-based evidence shows that the note-taking phase is strongly shaped by time and density pressures and that student naturally resort to compression behaviors. In a pilot study on consecutive interpreting training, ArumíRibas reports that speech delivery speed and information density are major difficulties during note-taking (ArumíRibas, 2012, pp. 821–822). In the same study, when students describe strategies used "when taking notes," the predominant options include summarizing, alongside omission and generalizing—all of which are concrete realizations of semantic compression (ArumíRibas, 2012, pp. 827–828).

Compression pressure during note-taking

Empirical classroom-based research shows that the note-taking phase is where time pressure becomes structurally unavoidable, because writing happens while listening and processing continue. In a pilot study based on post-task questionnaires, ArumíRibas reports that students explicitly identify delivery speed and information density as recurrent difficulties during note-taking, and—critically for semantic compression—that novice interpreters also report lack of understanding as a factor that directly affects note quality. This matters for semantic compression because it provides a documented motivation (not just a pedagogical assumption) for why interpreters must prioritize what to record. In ArumíRibas's results for the note-taking phase, speed of delivery is the most frequently reported difficulty for both groups (novice and advanced), while novices additionally report lack of understanding as affecting their note-taking (e.g., novices report "lack of understanding" during note-taking, whereas the advanced group reports it as absent in this phase), and novices also mention information density (to a lesser extent). (ArumíRibas, 2012, p. 822).

Why language choice and multilingual notation matter

Russian research on переводческаясемантография stresses that interpreter note-taking is rarely "monolingual" in practice. Alikina argues that interpreter notes reflect a multilingual consciousness and that the practical question is not simply "write in SL or TL," but which code (or mix of codes) is cognitively and graphically optimal under speed constraints. In her overview of positions on note-language choice, she explicitly lists three broad variants: (a) noting in the source language, (b) noting in the target language, and (c) using a mixed system. (Alikina, 2012, p. 23). Crucially, Alikina links language choice to time pressure and writing economy: because the interpreter has to write quickly, the "semantogram" tends to combine international abbreviations for institutions/countries, abbreviations in both native and foreign languages, symbols, numbers, Latin/Greek letters, and other compact graphic devices (Alikina, 2012, pp. 23–24). This matters for semantic compression because "compression" is not only about reducing words, but about selecting the fastest semiotic form that still triggers the intended meaning at recall.

European empirical work supports the claim that language choice is strategic rather than purely "source-vs-target" based. Dam's quantitative study shows that note-language choice is governed mainly by whether a language is the interpreter's A-language vs. B-language, more than by whether it is the source or target language in a given task (Dam, 2004, p. 12). Dam also provides a processing-based explanation: interpreters tend to choose the language that is easier/faster to write in, because this saves processing capacity for listening and analysis; writing in the target language can be more demanding since it introduces language conversion while listening (Dam, 2004, pp. 13–14). Importantly for "multilingual notation," Dam operationalizes additional categories beyond SL/TL, including a third language. In the pilot data he reports, "3rd L" is present (mean values reported, including a case where third-language items reach 16%) (Dam, 2004, p. 6).

A language-oriented theoretical framing is also developed in German-language scholarship: Kohn &Albl-Mikasa argue that notation is better described as an interpreting-specific "notation language" with lexical, syntactic, and pragmatic values, rather than a purely language-neutral technique (Kohn &Albl-Mikasa, 2002, p. 258–260).

They explicitly explain why a mixed notation is natural: notation signs deliberately draw on natural languages and it would be "uneconomical" not to use available linguistic resources; consequently, notation languages often develop a mixed character using "self-created or borrowed" means selected for processing advantages (Kohn &Albl-Mikasa, 2002, p. 260). From a classroom-based European case study (English→Polish), Hanusiak's data likewise show that mixed note language is common in training contexts: while there is a strong tendency toward SL, a large share of students use both SL and TL in their notes (Hanusiak, 2021, p. 57). This aligns with the broader point that multilingual notation is not an anomaly—it is often a default consequence of time pressure, salience, and perceived retrieval speed.

Uzbek-authored discussion also recognizes this logic and explicitly frames "foreign language expressions" (including possible third-language insertions) as one of several compression techniques alongside symbols and abbreviations. It also notes that in real settings interpreters/students may prepare notes in different languages and that third-language use can appear depending on convenience and the interpreter's multilingual background (Djurayeva, 2023, pp. 107–108).

Why this is especially relevant for English–Uzbek diplomatic interpreting

In English–Uzbek diplomatic interpreting, language choice in notes becomes a tool for preserving pragmatic stance (hedging, mitigation, institutional tone). English diplomatic discourse often packages stance in compact formulae ("It should be noted…", "it would be appropriate…") which can be compressed either by (a) keeping an English cue, (b) switching to an Uzbek cue, or (c) using a symbol—depending on what will be fastest to retrieve and least cognitively costly.

Example 1: "It should be noted …" → Uzbek official rendering with "ta'kidlamoqchiman"

English diplomatic source (official site):"It should be noted that in recent years we have been consciously pursuing this goal."

Uzbek official version (same speech): "… intilibkelganimiznita'kidlamoqchiman."

How to use this as evidence.The pair of official versions demonstrates that what is a stance-setting frame in English ("It should be noted…") is rendered in Uzbek via an explicit speaker-oriented performative("ta'kidlamoqchiman"). This supports your argument that if notes capture only the proposition (e.g., "pursuing goal"), the pragmatic cue that sets diplomatic tone may be lost at recall—so the cue itself should be encoded.Illustrative notation (hypothetical notes, not claimed as corpus data):

Option A (English cue): NB / note: pursue goal → HRC memb

Option B (Uzbek cue): ta'kid: maqsad→ Kengasha'zolik

Option C (symbol cue): (!) frame + goal→HRC

These are illustrations of how multilingual notation can encode the same pragmatic function with different semiotic costs—consistent with mixed-code semantography described by Alikina (2012, pp. 23–24) and with Dam's "choose the easier/faster code" explanation (Dam, 2004, pp. 13–14).

Example 2: "It would be appropriate …" → Uzbek "aynimuddaobo'laredi"

English diplomatic source (official MFA site):"… it would be appropriate to introduce the position of the Deputy Secretary-General …"

Uzbek official version: "… lavoziminijoriyetishaynimuddaobo'laredi."

Why this example is methodologically useful:

-the English construction "would be appropriate" is a clear mitigation/hedging strategy: it frames the action as a recommendation/proposal rather than a direct imposition.

-the Uzbek "aynimuddaobo'laredi" keeps that mitigated tone through an idiomatic modal evaluation rather than a direct imperative.

Illustrative notation (hypothetical):

-if the interpreter notes only: introduce DSg youth

→ there is a risk (at recall) of producing a stronger Uzbek modality like "joriyetiladi / joriyetishkerak," which can shift diplomatic tone.

-language-oriented cue encoding: app / maqsadgamuvofiq → introduce DSg youthor (~) introduce DSg youth where (~) is your personal hedge symbol. This aligns with your thesis that semantic compression must preserve pragmatic strength, not just propositional content—consistent with (a) Alikina's emphasis on mixed semiotic resources under speed pressure (Alikina, 2012, pp. 23–24) and (b) Dam's account of minimizing effort by choosing the fastest code while avoiding extra conversion load (Dam, 2004, pp. 13–14).

Because notation systems routinely draw on multiple linguistic codes plus symbols, language choice is not a secondary formatting issue—it is a core mechanism of semantic compression. Mixed-code notes can reduce writing time, manage cognitive load, and (if designed deliberately) protect diplomatically crucial meanings such as hedging and evaluative stance. This is consistent with Russian semantography arguments about multilingual consciousness and mixed resources (Alikina, 2012, pp. 23–24), with Scopus-indexed empirical evidence on language choice drivers (Dam, 2004, pp. 12–14), and with linguistic accounts treating notation as an individualized "notation language" rather than a neutral technique (Kohn &Albl-Mikasa, 2002, pp. 258–260).

Data and Methodology

To avoid unverifiable claims, this study relies exclusively on publicly accessible official diplomatic texts where both English and Uzbek versions are provided on the same official platform (via a language switch). The texts are treated as parallel official versions suitable for discourse-semantic illustration (rather than as transcripts of real interpreting).

Source 1 (President of Uzbekistan official website).

A diplomatic speech page titled "Speech by the President of the Republic of Uzbekistan ShavkatMirziyoyev at the 46th Session of the United Nations Human Rights Council", dated 22.02.2021, available in English and Uzbek (Latin) on the official presidential website.

This source contains clear stance and framing markers (e.g., the English framing "It should be noted …") and an Uzbek rendering that encodes stance with a speaker-oriented performative ("… ta'kidlamoqchiman."). These features make it suitable for examining how pragmatic framing is carried across the English–Uzbek pair.

Source 2 (Embassy of Uzbekistan in Spain — official MFA embassy platform).

A published diplomatic address titled "Address by President of the Republic of Uzbekistan ShavkatMirziyoyev at the meeting of the Council of Heads of State of the Organization of Turkic States", available in English and Uzbek (Latin) on the embassy's official site through a language switch.

This text is particularly rich in modal and mitigation-heavy formulations, such as:

-English mitigated recommendation: "it would be appropriate to introduce…"

-Uzbek mitigation counterpart: "… aynimuddaobo'laredi."

It also contains deontic modality and stance/concern signals:

-English: "should be in constant contact …" and "a source of great concern …"

-Uzbek: "… hamkorliknikuchaytirishilozim." and "… albattajiddiytashvishgasoladi …"

Sampling strategy and unit of analysis

This is an exploratory qualitative, discourse-oriented study. From each bilingual text, the analysis selects short parallel fragments (typically 1–3 sentences) that meet two criteria:

1. The English fragment contains at least one overt modality/stance/mitigation marker (e.g., should, would be appropriate, it should be noted, we intend, we express…).

2. An Uzbek fragment can be identified in the official Uzbek version (same passage location/sequence), allowing direct comparison of pragmatic strength (e.g., mitigation vs. categoricalness).

So, the unit of analysis is a marker-bearing discourse move, i.e., a proposition plus its pragmatic/semantic operator(s) (modal force, stance, mitigation).

Analytic framework: three semantic dimensions

The coding targets three dimensions which are directly observable in these texts:

1. Modality

Operational definition: linguistic devices that express obligation/necessity, intention, possibility, recommendation, or expected action.

Example (EN deontic): "should be in constant contact …"

Example (UZ deontic): "… kuchaytirishilozim."

2. Evaluative stance

Operational definition: lexical or constructional signals of approval/disapproval, concern, emphasis, endorsement, satisfaction/dissatisfaction.

Example (EN stance): "a source of great concern …"

Example (UZ stance): "… albattajiddiytashvishgasoladi …"

3. Pragmatic mitigation

Operational definition: hedging, softening, indirectness, and non-impositive recommendation style (common in diplomatic discourse).

Example (EN mitigation): "it would be appropriate to introduce…"

Example (UZ mitigation): "… aynimuddaobo'laredi."

Procedure: alignment + "note-based" analytic demonstration

The procedure is designed for replicability:

1. Locate marker-bearing fragments in the English text (e.g., “It should be noted…”, “it would be appropriate…”, “should be…”, “concern…”).

2. Align each fragment with its Uzbek counterpart by using the official Uzbek version on the same platform and matching passage order and content.

3. For each aligned pair, construct two hypothetical note representations (this is the “note-taking” part of the methodology):

-minimal-proposition note: keeps only the basic event/content (high compression, high risk of pragmatic loss).

-marker-sensitive note: encodes the proposition and at least one cue for modality/stance/mitigation (slightly denser notes, but pragmatically safer).

-compare how each note type would likely constrain the reconstruction of pragmatic force in Uzbek, using the official Uzbek version as an external benchmark for “acceptable diplomatic tone.”

This design does not claim that the official Uzbek version equals an interpreter’s output. It is used as a verifiable reference showing one institutionally accepted way to encode mitigation/stance in Uzbek diplomatic style.

Analytical focus

Following the meaning-oriented note-taking tradition, this study treats consecutive notes not as a reduced “text,” but as an interpreting-specific semiotic system that supports later reconstruction of meaning. In cognitive-linguistic terms, note-taking can be described through the constructs LANGUAGE and DISCOURSE, with attention not only to lexical meanings and text-level relations but also to pragmatic functions (Kohn &Albl-Mikasa, 2002, p. 258). At the same time, consecutive notes are constrained by the widely recognized principles of economy and instantaneous seizability (“read at a glance”), and are inevitably individualized (Kohn &Albl-Mikasa, 2002, p. 258). Therefore, the analytical focus of this paper is limited to pragmatic-semantic dimensions that are (a) highly consequential in diplomatic settings, and (b) observable and alignable in official English–Uzbek parallel diplomatic texts.

Modality (obligation/necessity; intention; endorsement)

In this study, modality is operationalized as linguistic markers that encode obligation/necessity (recommendation, requirement), intention/commitment, and (iii) endorsement/support. These are particularly important in diplomacy because they calibrate whether a statement is presented as a requirement, a plan, or a supportive position.

Obligation/necessity (EN “should” ↔ UZ “lozim”)

English (official): “… security services should be in constant contact …”

Uzbek (official): “… hamkorliknikuchaytirishilozim.”

This pair is used as a marker-bearing fragment: if notes compress away the modal operator (should/lozim), the reconstructed message may shift from obligation → description (i.e., from “should” to “are”).

Intention/commitment (EN “We intend …” ↔ UZ “niyatidamiz”)

English (official): “We intend to consistently continue …”

Uzbek (official): “… davomettirishniyatidamiz.”

Here, intention is not “extra style”—it is the core communicative force.

Endorsement/support (EN “endorse” ↔ UZ “ma’qullaymiz”)

English (official): “We fully endorse the proposal …”

Uzbek (official): “… taklifinitoʻliqma’qullaymiz.”

This is coded as endorsement rather than obligation: losing it can make the output sound like a unilateral decision instead of support for a proposal.

Evaluative stance (concern, approval, satisfaction; neutrality)

Evaluative stance is operationalized as markers that explicitly express the speaker’s attitude (e.g., concern, satisfaction, approval) or signal neutrality. In diplomatic discourse, stance markers often function as strategic signals: they communicate alignment, urgency, or caution without overt confrontation.

Concern (EN “concern” ↔ UZ “tashvishgasoladi”)

English (official): “… a source of great concern …”

Uzbek (official): "… jiddiytashvishgasoladi."

This fragment is treated as stance-critical: compressing it to a bare proposition (e.g., "Afghanistan situation complex") risks producing a pragmatically "colder" Uzbek output.

Satisfaction/positive stance (EN "pleased" ↔ UZ "mamnunman")

English (official): "I am pleased to announce …"

Uzbek (official): "… e'lonqilishdanmamnunman."

This pair supports the stance dimension and shows that stance is systematically encoded in both versions.

Pragmatic mitigation (hedging; indirect recommendation; de-intensification)

Pragmatic mitigation is operationalized as hedges and indirect formulations that soften imposition, lower categorical force, or frame proposals diplomatically. This dimension is especially relevant because mitigation is often what makes a statement "sound diplomatic" rather than blunt.

Indirect recommendation (EN "would be appropriate" ↔ UZ "boʻlaredi")

English (official): "it would be appropriate to introduce …"

Uzbek (official): "… joriyetishaynimuddaoboʻlaredi."

This is coded as mitigation rather than intention or obligation. If a highly compressed note records only "introduce position," the interpreter may reconstruct a stronger modality ("we will introduce / joriyetamiz"), shifting diplomatic force.

(b) Diplomatic framing hedge (EN "It should be noted" ↔ UZ "ta'kidlamoqchiman")

English (official): "It should be noted, that …"

Uzbek (official): "… ta'kidlamoqchiman."

This pair illustrates that framing devices may be rendered with different surface forms (hedge construction vs. performative verb), but remain pragmatically essential.

Procedure (what is and is not claimed)

This paper does not claim to analyze real interpreters' notebooks, because such notes are not publicly available for the selected official diplomatic materials. Consequently, the study does not evaluate interpreter performance or professional competence.

What is done: simulated notes as a risk-pattern demonstration

Instead, the study uses simulated note forms as an analytic instrument to demonstrate how different degrees of semantic compression can encode—or fail to encode—modality, stance, and mitigation. The goal is to identify risk patterns (where tone/pragmatic force is vulnerable), not to assess any individual interpreter. This design is consistent with pedagogical descriptions emphasizing that the success of consecutive interpreting depends heavily on mastery of a note system and the ability to perform multiple operations while listening. In particular, Bezus explains that accuracy and success in consecutive interpreting depend on the interpreter's competence in note-taking, including the ability to (i) select key segments, (ii) fix facts and logic, (iii) build a visual support for the future target text, (iv) do this while actively listening, and (v) reproduce content by "glancing" at notes rather than reading them (Bezus, 2023, p. 27).

Bezus also explicitly demonstrates training exercises aimed at "highlighting and depicting semantic dominants" through symbols (Bezus, 2023, p. 31), which directly supports the paper's meaning-focused analytical logic.

Step-by-step analytic workflow

Step 1 — Fragment selection from official bilingual texts.

From each official bilingual diplomatic text (President.uz and MFA Spain site), the analysis selects short fragments that contain at least one overt marker of:

-modality (e.g., should / lozim; intend / niyatidamiz; endorse / ma'qullaymiz),

-stance (e.g., concern / tashvishgasoladi; pleased / mamnunman),

-mitigation (e.g., would be appropriate / boʻlaredi; it should be noted / ta'kidlamoqchiman).

Step 2 — Alignment (EN ↔ UZ).

Each English fragment is aligned with its Uzbek counterpart by matching discourse position and content within the same official publication.

Step 3 — Annotation (dimension coding).

Each aligned pair is annotated in a small coding sheet with:

-PROP: propositional core (event/content),

-MOD: modality operator(s) (OBL/INT/END),-ST: stance label(s),

-MIT: mitigation type(s).

Step 4 — Two simulated note versions per fragment.

For each fragment pair, two note prototypes are created:

1. Proposition-only note (maximal compression)

-records only PROP (high risk to tone)

2. Cue-enriched note (controlled compression)

-records PROP + a minimal cue for MOD/ST/MIT

This respects the economy principle of note-taking ("as scarce and brief as possible") while still operationalizing the hypothesis that pragmatic meaning requires explicit cueing (Kohn &Albl-Mikasa, 2002, p. 258).

Step 5 — Risk comparison using the official Uzbek version as a pragmatic benchmark.

The analysis then compares how each simulated note version constrains the likely reconstruction of pragmatic force in Uzbek, using the official Uzbek text as an external, verifiable reference for one institutionally acceptable realization of diplomatic tone.

Discussion: Toward a Language-Oriented Semantic-Cue Layer

Across the two verified English–Uzbek diplomatic text pairs used in this study, the most compression-vulnerable layer is not the core proposition ("what happened / what is proposed"), but the pragmatic calibration ("how it is framed: hedged, endorsed, obligatory, concerned, etc."). This observation is consistent with the semantography view that notes are not a transcript, but a program for producing the target message: Alikina defines interpreting semantography as an analytic–synthetic processing and fixation of information "to reduce working-memory load" and to create a program for generating the translation text (Alikina, 2012, p. 23). It is also consistent with Uzbek methodological descriptions that semantographic notes should encode meaning and the main idea, not word-for-word sentences: Nurmatova explicitly states that semantography "does not write the sentence word-for-word" (that is stenography's task) and that the meaning is written briefly and expanded later during oral translation (Nurmatova, 2023, p. 160).

What diplomatic examples make especially visible is which meaning is easiest to lose when notes are maximally compressed:

1. Framing hedge (MIT / frame):

English: "It should be noted …"

Uzbek: "… ta'kidlamoqchiman."

If notes capture only the proposition ("Uzbekistan pursued goal / reforms"), the interpreter may reconstruct the content but omit the diplomatic framing move that signals controlled emphasis and institutional tone.

2. Mitigated recommendation (MIT / de-intensification):

English: "it would be appropriate to introduce …"

Uzbek: "… joriyetishaynimuddaoboʻlaredi."

If notes record only "introduce Deputy SG (youth)", the output can easily shift toward a stronger force ("we will introduce / we must introduce"), because the hedge itself is not "recoverable" from the proposition alone.

3. Necessity/obligation (OBL):

English: "security services should be in constant contact …"

Uzbek: "… hamkorliknikuchaytirishilozim."

Dropping the modal operator turns obligation into description and changes the diplomatic action-orientation.

To make this operational, my "semantic-cue layer" idea can be stated as a risk-control principle: under high compression, preserve at least one cue per fragment for modality class, stance, and/or mitigation, because these are the layers most likely to be lost while the proposition remains reconstructable. That is fully compatible with meaning-oriented traditions: it does not require "more writing," but more diagnostic writing (the smallest possible cue that still triggers the right pragmatic force at recall).

Why English–Uzbek is sensitive in diplomatic discourse

In the verified examples, English often encodes stance and modality through early or mid-sentence devices that frame the proposition as it unfolds, while the Uzbek versions frequently realize comparable functions via discourse verbs, clause-final evaluative phrasing, and necessity markers. Interpreters can demonstrate this sensitivity without generalizing beyond your dataset by pointing to the observable distribution in the two official sources:

1. Early framing in English vs. discourse-verb framing in Uzbek

English (President site): “It should be noted, that …”

Uzbek (samespeech): “… intilibkelganimiznita’kidlamoqchiman.”

Here the same pragmatic job—“institutional framing / controlled emphasis”—is realized with different surface packaging. For a note-taker, this matters because English gives the cue early, but Uzbek may require a speaker-oriented verb that must be placed naturally in Uzbek discourse. If the cue is not present in the notes, the interpreter can reproduce the facts while losing the institutional framing.

2. Mitigation via ‘appropriate’ vs. clause-final conditional evaluative phrasing

English (MFA/Embassy site): “it would be appropriate to introduce …”

Uzbek: “… joriyetishaynimuddaobo‘laredi.”

This is exactly the kind of place where “idea-only” notes become misleading: the idea (introduce a position) is clear, but the diplomatic calibration (a softened recommendation) is carried by a hedge that must survive compression.

3. Obligation markers realized compactly but critically

English: “… services should be in constant contact …”

Uzbek: “… hamkorliknikuchaytirishilozim.”

Even when Uzbek uses a compact marker like lozim, its placement and rhetorical force can be disturbed if the note contains only content nouns/verbs (e.g., “services—contact—cooperation”).

Overall, in these diplomatic samples, propositional content is comparatively stable across versions, but tone management is distributed differently across English and Uzbek surface structures. Therefore, “idea-only” compression can preserve “what” while drifting on “how,” which is exactly the layer diplomatic discourse cares about most.

Methodological significance for training and research

Training: “encode smarter,” under real note-taking constraints

A purely additive recommendation (“write more”) is not realistic, because the empirical constraint is clear: during the note-taking phase, students report speed of delivery as the major difficulty for both groups, and novices explicitly report that lack of understanding affects note quality; novices also mention information density (ArumíRibas, 2012, pp. 821–822). So any training refinement must remain lightweight. Here Bezus is useful because she formulates note-taking success as a set of professional sub-skills that include (among others) selecting key segments / semantic dominants, choosing rational ways to fix facts and logic, creating a visual support for the future target text, and doing so while actively listening (Bezus, 2023, p. 26).

A practical refinement: a minimal semantic-cue layer

This proposal can be justified as a minimal add-on compatible with meaning-fixation traditions:

- MIT~ = mitigation / framinghedge
- OBL! = obligation/necessity
- INT→ = intention/commitment
- END+ = endorsement/support
- ST:concern / ST:approve / ST:neutral = stance label

This sits comfortably inside established principles of notation economy and rapid readability. Kohn &Albl-Mikasa explicitly list economy (notes should be “as scarce and brief as possible”) and instantaneous seizability (must be readable “at a glance”) as undisputed principles (Kohn &Albl-Mikasa, 2002, p. 258). It also aligns with the observation that notation systems are often mixed (symbols + language material) because it is “uneconomical” not to draw on natural language resources, and because mixed character is common practice in professional and training contexts (Kohn &Albl-Mikasa, 2002, p. 260). In Uzbek methodological terms, it also matches the idea that notes intentionally remove redundancy and are later expanded during oral delivery (Nurmatova, 2023, p. 160). Moreover, in Russian semantography framing fits the idea of notes as a program for translation production rather than verbatim capture (Alikina, 2012, p. 23).

Methodologically, the "semantic-cue layer" gives interpreters something reviewers like: a clear operational link between (a) discourse-semantic categories (MIT/OBL/INT/END/ST) and (b) concrete notation features (tags/symbols). That makes future work measurable:

-experimental training study: cue-layer vs. baseline notes → compare pragmatic drift in output;

-annotation study: which cues are most often missing under high speech rate;

-language-pair extension: test whether the same cue categories behave similarly in other typologically divergent pairs.

In other words, the paper does not claim "the only solution," but proposes a replicable micro-intervention that directly targets the empirically plausible risk zone (pragmatic meaning) while respecting real-world note-taking constraints documented in training research.

REFERENCES

A) Academic sources actually used

1. ArumíRibas, M. (2012).Problems and Strategies in Consecutive Interpreting: A Pilot Study at Two Different Stages of Interpreter Training.Meta, 57(3), 812–835.
2. Language choice in notes (SL/TL mix; "third language"; A/B language effect) Dam, H. V. (2004).Interpreters' notes: On the choice of form and language.Interpreting, 6(1), 3–17.
3. Kohn, K., &Albl-Mikasa, M. (2002).Note-taking in consecutive interpreting: On the reconstruction of an individualised language.LinguisticaAntverpiensia, NewSeries – ThemesinTranslationStudies, 1, 257–272.
4. Hanusiak, D. (2021).The Choice of Language for Note-taking for the Purposes of Consecutive Interpreting: An English-Polish Case Study.MiędzyOryginałem a Przekładem, 27(4(54)), 51–61.
5. Gile, D. (1999).Testing the Effort Models' tightrope hypothesis in simultaneous interpreting: A contribution.Hermes – Journal of Language and Communication Studies, 23, 153–172. Pages used:p. 154 (Effort Models framing: interpreting operates near limits of available processing capacity; efforts split conceptually).

B) Russian&Uzbeksemantographysources

6. Аликина, Е. В. (2012).Переводческая семантография в последовательном переводе: проблема выбора языка записи.Филологические науки. Вопросы теории и практики, №7(18), Ч. II, 22–24.
7. Nurmatova, D. Sh. q. (2023).Ketma-kettarjimadanutqniqaydetishda tarjimasematografiyasiningahamiyati.EducationalResearchinUniversalSciences, 2 (SpecialIssue 4), 159–161.
8. Безус, Н. С. (2023).Введение элементов переводческой семантографии на начальном этапе профессиональной подготовки переводчиков.Вестник Самарского университета. История, педагогика, филология, 29(4), 25–31.

C) Core classic manual excerpt

9. Rozan, J.-F. (1956).Note-taking in Consecutive Interpreting. (Excerpt PDF: "The Seven Principles").

D) Diplomatic bilingual data sources used

10. Official website of the President of Uzbekistan – Speech at the 46th Session of the UN Human Rights Council (dated 22.02.2021).
11. Uzbekistan MFA / Embassy site (Spain) – Presidential speech text in the Organization of Turkic States context (dated 11.11.2022, bilingual EN/UZ available via language switch).